

REMARKS

A review of the claims indicates that:

- A) Claims 1—80 were originally filed.
- B) Claims 39—49, 52—63, 65—67 and 70—80 were previously withdrawn.
- C) Claims 3, 6—7, 9—10, 12—22, 24—31, 33—38, 50—51 and 68—69 remain in their original form.
- D) Claims 1—2, 4—5, 8, 23, 32, 64 are currently amended.
- E) No claims are new.
- F) Claim 11 is canceled.

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the subject application.

35 U.S.C. §102, the Koppolu '701 Reference

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under §102 as being anticipated by U.S. 5,801,701 by Koppolu (herein after the Koppolu or '701 reference). Claim 1 has been amended to recite the limitations of claim 11; claim 3 continues to depend from claim 1. Claim 11 was rejected under §103 as being unpatentable due to the '701 reference in view of U.S. 6,225,996 by Gibb (herein after the Gibb or '996 reference). Because claim 1 has been amended to additionally recite the elements of claim 11, the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 1 by addressing the §103 rejection of claim 11.

The Gibb '996 Reference

The Gibb '996 reference discloses a feature for use with a spreadsheet application, wherein display of a selected non-active cell on a display screen is facilitated, even when the cell is not currently visible in the on-screen window. The user is therefore able to observe the results of certain operations on the

1 contents of the selected cell without scrolling to the location of the cell. Referring
2 particularly to FIG. 6 of Gibb, the display 602 (very bottom, center) shows the
3 value of the non-active cell which need not even be currently visible on the screen
(e.g. not visible within the window 601).

4 The Gibb '996 reference does not disclose free floating fields. Free floating
5 fields are akin to spreadsheet values that may be inserted anywhere within a
6 document. For example, a free floating field may be inserted into the body of a
7 text-based document, and, having been so inserted, the free floating field would
8 appear as a natural part of the text. In contrast, Gibb discloses only a spread sheet
9 window 601 and the display field 602, which is fixed. Thus, Gibb does not
disclose the elements (free floating fields) for which it was cited.

10 Traversal of the claim 1 rejection

11 Because claim 1 has been amended to additionally recite the elements of
12 claim 11, the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 1 by
13 addressing the §103 rejection of claim 11.

14 Claim 1 has been amended to recite a method comprising:
15 presenting a word processing table within a document; and
16 presenting a free floating field configured for insertion into the document;
17 exhibiting spreadsheet features together with the word processing table
when a user is editing the word processing table; and
18 enabling a user to reference a cell in the word processing table when
entering a formula into the free floating field.

19 The Patent Office has rejected claim 11 (and therefore the amended claim
20 1) using the combined Koppolu '701 and Gibb '996 references. Gibb was cited
21 for its contribution of "presenting a free floating field." In particular, the Patent
22 Office cited column 2 lines 45—67 and column 3, lines 1—2. However, the
23 material disclosed in the cite passages relates to the "on-screen window" (col. 2,
24 line 58) which is later referred to as display field 602 (e.g. col. 8, line 28). This
25 on-screen window/display field 602 is not a free floating field.

1 The display field 602 (on-screen window) fails to disclose or suggest the
2 properties of a free floating field. In particular, the field does not display the
3 “floating” quality. As an illustration, a free floating field is akin to a spreadsheet
4 value that may be inserted anywhere in a document, including the middle of a text-
5 based body of a word processing document, wherein it will appear as a natural part
6 of the text. (See Applicant’s specification, bottom of page 16 and top of page 17.)
7 Exemplary nature of free floating fields is illustrated in several of the Applicant’s
8 figures; in particular, 408 of Fig. 4 and 608 of Fig. 6 (discussed on bottom of page
9 16 and top of 17) show characteristics of free floating fields. Thus, it is seen that
10 the field 602 of Gibb is not such a field.

11 Gibb’s field 602 lacks a characteristic quality of free floating fields: Gibb’s
12 field 602 cannot be inserted into the text-based body of a document, wherein it
13 will appear as a natural part of the text. In sharp contrast, Gibb’s field 602 is fixed
14 into the status bar 604 (Gibb, col. 8, lines 20—25) wherein it will be visible even
15 when the spreadsheet cell which it represents is not visible within the spreadsheet
16 window 601 (Gibb, col. 8, lines 10—40). Thus, free floating fields are configured
17 for location within text, wherein they appear as part of the text while retaining
18 their spreadsheet functionality. In contrast, Gibb’s display field 602 is fixed in the
19 display bar, where it may conveniently be viewed, even when the cell
20 corresponding to the field 602 is no longer visible. Clearly, the material recited in
21 the Applicant’s claim 1, as amended, and Gibb’s disclosure are quite different.

22 The applicant has further distinguished free floating fields from Gibb’s
23 field 602, fixed into the status bar 604, by amending claim 1 to recite “configured
24 for insertion into the document.” This phrase more particularly points out the
25 nature and functionality of free floating fields generally, and more specifically,
their differences when compared to the fixed field 602 of the Gibb ‘996 reference.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1. Accordingly, claim 3 is allowable by
virtue this dependence. Additionally, claim 3 is allowable for reasons associated
with the elements recited in claim 3.

1 **35 U.S.C. §102, the Mansfield Reference**

2 Claim 64 was rejected under §102 as being anticipated by “Excel 97 for
3 busy people” by Mansfield, hereinafter “Mansfield.” Claim 64 has been amended
4 to depend from claim 1. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

5 Claim 64, as amended, depends from claim 1. Accordingly, claim 64 is
6 allowable by virtue this dependence. Additionally, claim 64 is allowable for
7 reasons associated with the elements recited in claim 64.

8 **35 U.S.C. §102, the Sorge Reference**

9 Claims 68—69 were rejected under §102 as being anticipated by U.S.
10 6,691,281, hereinafter “Sorge.” The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

11 Claims 68 and 69 recite:

12 68. A user interface comprising:
13 a first spreadsheet table supporting spreadsheet functionality and having
14 multiple cells; and
15 a second spreadsheet table nested within a cell of the first table.

16 69. The user interface of claim 68, wherein one of the first and second
17 tables contains a formula referencing contents of the other of the first and second
18 tables.

19 **The Sorge ‘281 Reference**

20 The Sorge reference discloses publishing data tables in HTML documents
21 while maintaining formatting and functionality for restoring the data tables. In a
22 general sense, Sorge discloses systems and methods by which data may be moved
23 between spreadsheet programs and HTML documents. Sorge does not disclose “a
24 second spreadsheet table nested within a cell of the first table.” In fact, Sorge does
25 not disclose the concept of *nesting*, i.e. *containing one spreadsheet inside a cell of*
another spreadsheet.

Traversal of rejection of claims 68—69

1 The Patent Office suggests that column 4, lines 10—20 of the Sorge
2 reference disclose the elements of claim 68. However, upon review of the cited
3 passage, no reference to the concept of nesting one spreadsheet inside a cell of
4 another spreadsheet is made. In fact, the passage discloses a spreadsheet having
5 data including a plurality of cells. One cell includes a formula which interacts
6 with an HTML document. However, no reference is made to a second spreadsheet
7 which is nested into a cell of a first spreadsheet. In fact, nothing in Sorge is
8 related to the concept of “nesting.” Accordingly, claim 68 is allowable, and the
9 Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be removed.

10 Claim 69 depends from claim 68. Accordingly, claim 69 is allowable by
11 virtue this dependence. Additionally, claim 69 is allowable for reasons associated
12 with the elements recited in claim 69.

35 U.S.C. §103, Koppolu ‘701 in view of Lowry ‘878

13 Claims 2, 4—9, 50—51 were rejected under §103 as being unpatentable
14 due to Koppolu in view of U.S. patent 6,549,878, hereinafter “Lowry.”

The Lowry ‘878 Reference

15 The Lowry ‘878 reference was filed on 31 December 1998 and issued on
16 15 April 2003. The instant application was filed on 21 June 2000. As such,
17 Lowry qualifies as prior art only under the timing provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102(e).
18

19 Lowry is assigned to the Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, WA. The
20 instant application is also assigned to the Microsoft Corporation of Redmond,
21 WA. At the time of the invention of the subject matter of the instant invention,
22 there was an obligation to assign that subject matter to Microsoft, and accordingly
23 the instant application was assigned to Microsoft upon filing, and Microsoft
24 owned the Lowry application and later Lowry patent and/or application, before,
25 during and after the invention of the instant application. Accordingly, the Lowry
reference and the instant claimed invention were, at the time the instant claimed

1 invention was made, owned in common by Microsoft and were subject to an
2 obligation of assignment to Microsoft. And therefore, the Applicant hereby
3 asserts that all of the elements required to remove the Lowry reference as prior art
4 are in fact true and present in this case.

5 As such, Lowry is not available as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103, as is
6 discussed in more detail in MPEP §706.02(l)(1), entitled "Rejections Under 35
7 U.S.C. 102(e)/103; 35 U.S.C. 103(c)". This MPEP section cites 35 U.S.C. 103(c):

8 35 U.S.C. 103. Conditions for patentability; non-obvious
9 subject matter.

10 (c) Subject matter developed by another person, which
11 qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f),
12 and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability
13 under this section where the subject matter and the claimed
14 invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the
15 same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same
16 person.

17 More specifically, this MPEP section states that "Effective November 29,
18 1999, subject matter which was prior art under former 35 U.S.C. 103 via 35
19 U.S.C. 102(e) is now disqualified as prior art against the claimed invention if that
20 subject matter and the claimed invention "were, at the time the invention was
21 made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the
22 same person." This change to 35 U.S.C. 103(c) applies to all utility, design and
23 plant patent applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, including
24 continuing applications filed under 37 CFR 1.53(b), continued prosecution
25 application filed under 37 CFR 1.53(d), and reissues."

Accordingly, Lowry is not available as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §103 with
respect to this application, and, as such, the rejection of claims 2, 4—9 and 50—51
is prima facie defective. Additionally, no other grounds for rejection have been
lodged regarding claims 2, 4—9 and 50—51. Accordingly, claims 2, 4—9 and
50—51 are currently in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103, Koppolu '701 in view of Gibb '996

Claims 10—15, 19—26, 28—35 and 37—38 were rejected under §103 as being unpatentable due to Koppolu in view of Gibb.

Claims 10 and 12—13 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 10 and 12—13 are allowable by virtue this dependence. Additionally, claims 10 and 12—13 are allowable for reasons associated with the elements recited in claims 10 and 12—13.

Claim 11 was cancelled, and the elements recited therein were added to claim 1.

Claim 14 recites:

14. A method comprising:
presenting a word processing table, the table having multiple cells; and
overlaying a formula edit box on a particular cell in the table to facilitate user entry of a formula into the particular cell.

The Gibb reference does not disclose “overlaying formula edit boxes.” Instead, Gibb teaches the use of a display field 602 which is embedded within the status bar 604. Accordingly, Gibb does not disclose overlaying any type of edit box over any cell. Referring to Fig. 6 of Gibb, it is clearly evident that the field 602 does not overlay any cell, since it is located at the bottom of the screen, thereby overlaying no cell.

Referring to the bottom of page 28 and Figs. 3, 5 and 6 of the Applicant’s specification, examples of the formula edit box are discussed. In Fig. 3, a formula edit box 312 *hovers over* cell C6 to accept the summation formula. In Fig. 5, a formula edit box 506 *floats above* cell C3 and is resized to accommodate the expanded formula. Notice that the underlying table cell C3 is not resized, but remains the same size and shape within the table. In Fig. 6, a formula edit box 610 *resides above* the free floating field 608 and is *resized* to hold the long formula. Thus, it can be seen that the formula edit box overlays some cell within the table, thereby facilitating formula entry into that cell.

1 Accordingly, since Gibb fails to disclose “overlaying a formula edit box on
2 a particular cell,” the Applicant respectfully request that the rejection of claim 14
3 be withdrawn.

4 Claim 15 recites “wherein the formula edit box initially defaults to a size
5 and shape of the particular cell in the table.”

6 As seen above, the Gibb reference discloses a display field 602 which is
7 fixed into the status bar. Nothing in Gibb discloses resizing the shape of the
8 display field 602.

9 The Patent Office suggests that two passages in Gibb disclose an initial size
10 of the edit box which defaults to the size of the particular cell in the table.
11 However, as we have seen, Gibb does not disclose overlaying; accordingly, Gibb
12 has no reason to size the field 602 equal to the size of the cell with which it is
13 associated.

14 Accordingly, since Gibb fails to disclose a formula edit box which initially
15 defaults to a size and shape of the particular cell in the table, the Applicant
16 respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 15 be withdrawn.

17 Claims 19—22 depend from claim 14. Accordingly, claims 19—22 are
18 allowable by virtue this dependence. Additionally, claims 19—22 is allowable for
19 reasons associated with the elements recited in claims 19—22. For example,
20 claim 21 recites a free floating field. As seen above with respect to the argument
21 of claim 1, Gibb does not disclose free floating fields. Accordingly, claim 21 is
22 allowable for many of the same reasons which make claim 1, as amended,
23 allowable.

24 Claims 23—26, 28—35 and 37—38 were rejected “along the same
25 rationale” as a number of other claims. Accordingly, the Applicant reasserts with
respect to claims 23—26, 28—35 and 37—38 the arguments for allowance
previously applied to the claims cited by the Patent Office.

1 In particular, claims 23 and 32 have been amended to recite material from
2 claim 14, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons for which claim 14 is
allowable.

3 Additionally, the Applicant notes that in one or more cases, the nature of
4 the rejection is very unclear. For example, claim 28, related to nesting, seems to
5 be related to claim 68. Claims 1 and 10 appear to be unrelated to the “nesting”
6 concepts. Accordingly, claim 28 is also allowable for reasons associated with
7 claim 68, in that none of the references of record disclose “nesting” as recited in
8 the Applicant’s claims.

9 **35 U.S.C. §103, Koppolu ‘701 in view of Lowry ‘878**

10 Claims 16—18, 27 and 36 were rejected under §103 as being unpatentable
11 due to Koppolu in view of “Lowry.”

12 As seen above, Lowry is assigned to the Microsoft Corporation, Redmond,
13 WA. The instant application is also assigned to the Microsoft Corporation of
14 Redmond, WA. As such, Lowry is not available as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103.
15 Accordingly, the rejection of claims 16—18, 27 and 36 is prima facie defective.
16 Additionally, no other grounds for rejection have been lodged regarding claims
17 16—18, 27 and 36. Accordingly, these claims are currently in condition for
allowance.

18
19 **Conclusion**

20 The Applicant submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance
21 and respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowability be issued. If the Office’s
22 next anticipated action is not the issuance of a Notice of Allowability, the
23 Applicant respectfully requests that the undersigned attorney be contacted for the
24 purpose of scheduling an interview.
25

1 Respectfully Submitted,

2
3 Dated: 8-5-04

By: 

David S. Thompson
Reg. No. 37,954
Attorney for Applicant

LEE & HAYES PLLC
Suite 500
421 W. Riverside Avenue
Spokane, Washington 99201
Telephone: 509-324-9256 x235
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979